

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

VITA YANCY,
Plaintiff

vs.

ZENITH ACQUISITION
CORPORATION AND
DAVID PARIS,
Defendants

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Jury Trial Demanded

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is an action for damages brought by an individual plaintiff for Defendants' violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act, Chapter 392 (hereinafter "TDCPA"), the Texas Business and Commerce Code, Subchapter E, Chapter 17, (hereinafter "DTPA"), which prohibit debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices, and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227.

2. Plaintiff seeks to recover monetary damages for Defendants' violation of the FDCPA, the TDCPA, DTPA, and TCPA and to have an Order or injunction issued by this Court preventing Defendants from continuing its violative behaviors.

3. Service may be made upon Defendants in any other district in which it may be found pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §1132(e)(2).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) and 28 U.S.C. § 1337.

5. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b), where the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff's action occurred in this district, where Plaintiff resides in this district, and/or where Defendants transact business in this district.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff, Vita Yancy ("Plaintiff"), is a natural person residing in Waller County.

7. Plaintiff is a consumer as defined by the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3) and the Texas Business and Commerce Code section §17.50(a)(1) and Texas Finance Code §392.001(1).

8. Defendant, Zenith Acquisition Corporation ("ZAC") is an entity who at all relevant times was engaged, by use of the mails and telephone, in the business of attempting to collect a "debt" from Plaintiff, as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5) and by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(6).

9. Defendant, David Paris (“Paris”) is an individual who at all relevant times was engaged, by use of the mails and telephone, in the business of attempting to collect a “debt” from Plaintiff, as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5).

10. “Employees can be held personally liable under the FDCPA.” *Robinson v. Managed Accounts Receivable Corp.*, 654 F. Supp. 2d 1051, 1059 (C.D. Cal. 2009); see *Schwarm v. Craighead*, 552 F. Supp. 2d 1056, 1070-71 (E.D. Cal. 2008).

11. Furthermore, “most district courts that have addressed the issue have held that the corporate structure does not insulate shareholders, officers, or directors from personal liability under the FDCPA.” *Schwarm v. Craighead*, 552 F. Supp. 2d 1056, 1070-71 (E.D. Cal. 2008); see *Kistner v. Law Offices of Michael P. Margelefsky, L.L.C.*, 518 F.3d 433, 437-38 (6th Cir. 2008); *del Campo v. Kennedy*, 491 F. Supp. 2d 891, 903 (N.D.Cal.2006); *Brumbelow v. Law Offices of Bennett & Deloney, P.C.*, 372 F.Supp.2d 615, 618-21 (D. Utah 2005); *Albanese v. Portnoff Law Assocs., Ltd.*, 301 F. Supp. 2d 389, 400 (E.D. Pa. 2004); *Musso v. Seiders*, 194 F.R.D. 43, 46-47 (D.Conn.1999); *Brink v. First Credit Res.*, 57 F. Supp. 2d 848, 861-62 (D. Ariz. 1999); *Pikes v. Riddle*, 38 F. Supp. 2d 639, 640 (N.D. Ill. 1998); *Ditty v. CheckRite, Ltd.*, 973 F. Supp. 1320, 1337-38 (D. Utah 1997); *Newman v. Checkrite Cal., Inc.*, 912 F. Supp. 1354, 1372 (E.D. Cal.1995); *Teng v. Metro. Retail Recovery Inc.*, 851 F. Supp. 61, 67 (E.D. N.Y. 1994).

12. Zenith Acquisition Corporation and David Paris (“Defendants”) are “debt collectors” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) and by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(2).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13. Plaintiff is a natural person obligated, or allegedly obligated, to pay a debt owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due a creditor other than Defendants.

14. Plaintiff's obligation, or alleged obligation, owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due a creditor other than Defendants, arise from a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services that are the subject of the transaction were incurred primarily for personal, family, or household purposes and Plaintiff incurred the obligation, or alleged obligation, owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due a creditor other than Defendants.

15. Defendants use instrumentalities of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of any debts, and/or regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due another.

16. Within one (1) year preceding the date of this Complaint, Defendants made and/or placed a telephone call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number, in effort to collect from Plaintiff an obligation, or alleged obligation, owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due a creditor other than Defendants.

17. Within one (1) year preceding the date of this Complaint, Defendants willfully and knowingly utilized an automatic telephone dialing system to make and/or place a telephone call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number, in effort to collect from Plaintiff an obligation, or alleged obligation, owed or due, or asserted to be owed or due a creditor other than Defendants.

18. Defendants placed a call to Plaintiff's residence on November 12, 2010 @ 9:57 A.M., and at such time, failed to notify Plaintiff that the communication was from a debt collector. (15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11), Tex Fin Code § 392.304(a)(5)(B)).

19. Defendants initiated non-emergency calls to Plaintiff's residential telephone line utilizing an artificial or pre-recorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of Plaintiff. (47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B)).

**COUNT I—FDCPA
DEFENDANT ZAC**

20. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above.

21. Defendant's aforementioned conduct violated the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- a) Adjudging that Defendant violated the FDCPA;
- b) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k, in the amount of \$1,000.00;

- c) Awarding Plaintiff actual damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k;
- d) Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action;
- e) Awarding Plaintiff any pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as may be allowed under the law;
- f) Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**COUNT II—FDCPA
DEFENDANT PARIS**

22. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above.

23. Defendant's aforementioned conduct violated the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- g) Adjudging that Defendant violated the FDCPA;
- h) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k, in the amount of \$1,000.00;
- i) Awarding Plaintiff actual damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k;
- j) Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action;
- k) Awarding Plaintiff any pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as may be allowed under the law;

- 1) Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**COUNT III—TDCPA
DEFENDANT ZAC**

24. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation above.

25. Defendant violated the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Failing to disclose that the communication is from a debt collector, where such communication was a written or oral communication between Defendant and Plaintiff subsequent to the initial communication. (Tex Fin Code § 392.304(a)(5)(B));
- b. Using false representations or deceptive means to collect a debt or obtain information concerning a consumer, including (Tex Fin Code § 392.304(a)(19)).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- a) Adjudging that Defendant violated the TDCPA;
- b) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages pursuant to the TDCPA;
- c) Awarding Plaintiff actual damages pursuant to the TDCPA;
- d) Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action;

- e) Awarding Plaintiff any pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as may be allowed under the law;
- f) Awarding such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

**COUNT IV—TCPA
DEFENDANT ZAC**

26. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation above.

27. Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) by willfully and knowingly utilizing an automatic telephone dialing system to make and/or place a telephone call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment, as follows:

- a) Adjudging that Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii);
- b) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), in the amount of \$500.00 per violation;
- c) Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C), in the amount of \$1,500.00 per violation;
- d) Awarding Plaintiff actual damages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- e) Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action;

- f) Awarding Plaintiff any pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as may be allowed under the law.

**COUNT V—DTPA
DEFENDANT ZAC**

28. Plaintiff reincorporates by reference herein all prior paragraphs above.

29. This suit is brought, in part, under the authority of Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 17.41 et seq., commonly known as the Deceptive Trade Practices and Plaintiff Protection Act and cited in this petition as the “DTPA”.

30. Defendant was given notice in writing of the claims made in this Petition more than sixty days before this suit was filed in the manner and form required by DTPA §17.505 (a).

31. Defendant made numerous material misrepresentations in an attempt to collect the purported consumer debt as detailed above.

32. Defendant knew or should have known that its representations were false and/or acted in reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of its representations.

33. Defendant’s actions were done maliciously and in willful, wanton and reckless disregard for the rights of the Plaintiff.

34. Defendant’s actions as detailed above constitute a violation of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 17.41.

35. The conduct described above has been and is a producing and proximate cause of damages to Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s damages include: Statutory

damages of at least \$100.00 per violation, actual/economic damages, emotional and/or mental anguish damages, exemplary/punitive damages, and Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs.

36. Additionally, Plaintiff seeks an award of discretionary additional damages in an amount not to exceed three times the amount of economic damages if Defendant's conduct is found to have been committed knowingly; or an amount not to exceed three times the amount of economic and mental anguish damages if Defendants' conduct is found to have been committed intentionally.

37. Plaintiff seeks reasonable and necessary attorney's fees in this case through the time judgment is entered and for any post-trial or post-judgment appeals, to be detailed through a statement of services submitted at the appropriate time.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment as follows:

- (a) a declaratory judgment be entered that Defendant's conduct violated the DTPA;
- (b) an award for all actual damages, exemplary damages, emotional/mental anguish damages and all statutory additional damages, all attorneys fees, costs of court, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest lawful rates.

(c) an award of discretionary additional damages in an amount not to exceed three times the amount of economic damages if Defendant's conduct is found to have been committed knowingly; or an amount not to exceed three times the amount of economic and mental anguish damages if Defendant's conduct is found to have been committed intentionally.

(d) such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY

38. Plaintiff is entitled to and hereby demands a trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Dennis R. Kurz

Dennis R. Kurz

Texas State Bar # 24068183

Southern District Bar No. 1045205

Attorney in Charge for Plaintiff

WEISBERG & MEYERS, L.L.C.

Two Allen Center

1200 Smith Street

16th Floor

Houston, TX 77002

(888) 595-9111 ext. 412

(866) 842-3303 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 11, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, using the electronic case filing system of the court.

/s/ Dennis R. Kurz

Dennis R. Kurz